REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 20, 2005, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8 and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable over USP 5,093,908, hereinafter *Beacom*. *Beacom* includes, among other elements, a logic circuit 302 which receives several inputs such as the output from the sequencer 301, the output of the exception mask register 360, and bus lines 304. If the inputs to the logic 302 meet certain conditions, the logic 302 outputs a hold signal 303. See column 6, lines 9 – 18. The hold signal is not a signal received by the logic 302, it is merely an on/off type signal to stop the control store 130 to inhibit the next word. See column 4, lines 65 – 68.

The Examiner alleges that the logic circuit 302 corresponds to the claimed "selector". However, the selector is clearly defined in claim 1 as selectively supplying the dedicated circuit portion with <u>selected control signals</u> that are selected from among the <u>first</u> *control* signals supplied from the sequence control portion and the <u>second</u> *control* signals supplied from the general purpose data processing unit. Claim 1 further indicates that the second control signals supersede the first control signals and the general purpose data processing unit is able to control the dedicated circuit portion instead of the sequence control portion. Thus, as now defined in claim 1, the "selector" selects from among first and second control signals.

In contrast to the claimed selector, the logic 302 of *Beacom* does not select from among a plurality of control signals. The logic 302 merely outputs a single hold signal 303 if certain conditions are met. Thus, whereas the selector of claim 1 actually transfers control of the dedicated circuit portion from the sequence control